

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 17 were rejected. Claim 16 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would otherwise be allowable. Claims 15 and 17 are amended herein. Claim 16 is cancelled herein. No new matter is added. Claims 15 and 17 are now pending. The above amendments and the following remarks are considered by Applicants to overcome each rejection raised by the Examiner and to place the application in condition for allowance.

Examiner Interview

On August 18, 2009, a telephonic Examiner Interview was held. Counsel for Applicants provided a proposed amended claim 15 for discussion purposes. The amended claim clarified that the bars at the second ends “extend in a substantially horizontal manner.” Further, the amended claim added that the bars at the second ends “are connected by an insulated portion.” The Examiner agreed that each of these amendments would overcome the current rejections based on the Abe reference.

Drawings

The Examiner objected that the drawings did not show each feature of claim 16. Applicants have cancelled claim 16, and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections of claim 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Abe (Japanese Publication No. JP 02248121A). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended claims 17 as discussed during the Examiner interview. Accordingly, claim 17 now requires that the bars at the second ends “extend in a substantially horizontal manner” and “are connected by an insulated portion.” As the Examiner conceded, Abe fails to disclose each of these limitations. Abe’s purported bars (16A and 16B) extend vertically and are not connected (see Fig. 1).

Thus, Abe cannot disclose each limitation of amended claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Rejections of claim 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Mathauser (U.S. Pat. No. 3,786,391). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As indicated above, Applicants have amended claim 15 to require that the bars at the second ends “extend in a substantially horizontal manner” and “are connected by an insulated portion.” As discussed above, the Examiner concedes that Abe fails to disclose these limitations. Further, Mathauser fails to cure these deficiencies. Further, it would not have been obvious to modify Abe to arrive at the claimed invention because Abe’s purported bars (16A and 16B) must extend vertically and be unconnected in order to receive headphones.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the invention of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

An early action on the merits of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene LeDonne
Reg. No. 35,830
Joseph Miller, III
Reg. No. 61,748

REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10022
(P) 212-521-5400

Attorney for Applicant